

REMARKS

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 27 to 52 with claims 27-36, 42-48, 51 and 52 being withdrawn from consideration.

With regard to the attached replacement Figures, "Heat resistant fiber" referenced in Figure 1(C) by a, b and c and in Fig 2(C) by d, e and f, has been amended to "Heat resistant fiber or Stainless steel wire" in replacement Figures 1(C) and 2(C). See the attached marked up figures.

Support is evident throughout the present specification e.g. page 12, line 22 to page 13, line 12.

The drawings have been objected to in failing to depict the recitation (in claims 37 and 49?) that "the warp direction of the fabric structure is arranged in the same direction as the winding length".

Claims 37 and 49 have also been rejected as indefinite in the use of such terminology.

This objection and rejection are respectfully traversed.

In the presently claimed conveyor belt as shown in attached supplemental FIG 1, presented for this explanation and not a part of the specification, the pitch of the crest of corrugated roll and the pitch of the warp of the belt certainly and evenly intersect in a point contact, by forming a fabric structure bylapping one another, such that a warp direction of the fabric structure is arranged in the same direction as a winding length direction of the belt.

On the other hand, if the warp is lapped at 45 degrees in respect to the crest, a number of sections where the belt and the corrugated roll intersect in a point contact decreases, compared to lapping the warp in the same direction as a winding length direction of the belt, as shown in attached supplemental FIG. 2, also presented for explanation and not a part of the specification.

Accordingly, by arranging a warp direction of the fabric structure in the same direction as the winding length direction of the belt, the number of the point contacts increase and adhesiveness between the corrugated roll and the belt is improved.

Figs. 1A-1C and Figs. 2A-2B do not show a line which indicates the crest of the corrugated roll. Although the line indicating the crest of corrugated roll is not described in the figures and specification, such line is indirectly shown in Fig. 5 which depicts a side view of the device for manufacturing a single faced corrugated board using the belt of the present invention.

In Fig. 5, reference 4 indicates an upper corrugating roll among the corrugating rolls. In view of Figs. 1A, 1B and 1C and the arrangement of the processing belt 7 and the upper corrugating roll 4, it is readily understood that a ridge of the crest of the upper corrugating roll indicates the weft direction of the belt and a liner 9 (direction depicted via arrow with reference letter Y) indicates warp direction of the belt.

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not require the feature in issue to be directly depicted in the drawings and would understand what is meant by this feature.

The Examiner questions how Figs. 1A-1C differ from Figs. 2A-2C. In reply Figs. 1A and 1B are the same as Figs. 2A and 2B. The reference numeral 13 in Fig. 1C indicates an outmost layer of the belt, and the reference numeral 11 in Fig. 2B indicates an innermost layer of the belt. Therefore, it is not correct to compare Fig 1C and Fig. 2B.

Claims 37-41 and 49-50 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Kitamura (JP 11-105171A) in view of Meadows (US 3,924,482).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As the rejection notes, Kitamura does not expressly disclose that the fabric structure is formed by lapping its wires on one another such that the warp direction of the fabric structure is arranged in the same direction as the winding length direction of the belt.

Meadows has been cited to depict this feature.

In Meadows' device, the direction of warp 23 of strip 22 is parallel in the longitudinal direction relative to strip 22. However, warp 23 is inclined at an angle Θ with respect to belt body 21.

In contrast, in the presently claimed belt, the fabric structure is formed by lapping one another such that a warp direction of the fabric structure is arranged in a same direction as winding length direction of the belt.

Thus, Meadows fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kitamura.

It is not clear if the Examiner intends to rely on Yazawa (US 4,052,243) since no rejection has been made on this reference.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroshi ISHIBUCHI et al.

By _____ /Matthew M. Jacob/
2011.06.08 15:43:54 -04'00'

Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/amp
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 8, 2011